

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claim 8 has been cancelled, while the remaining claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 13, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,966,135 to Roy et al. The Examiner has further rejected claims 2 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al. in view of U.K. Patent Application No. GB 2,344,037 to Smith. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 7, 11, 12 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,459,986 to Boyce et al.

The Roy et al. patent discloses vector-based geographic data in which on, for example, a display of a map, the user, by using a mouse cursor, positions the cursor to any desired point on the map and then, by clicking the mouse button, the user may zoom by an adjustable factor to an area surrounding the point indicated by the mouse cursor.

The subject invention also relates to the display of, for example, a map, and zooming in to a desired point on the map. The subject invention enables this on a touch-sensitive display in which the selection of the desired point is indicated by the user performing a touch-input. However, while a cursor when directed by a mouse is very accurate, a user's finger performing a touch-input is highly inaccurate. In order to alleviate the frustrations of a

system acting on an incorrect selection, the subject invention, as claimed in claim 1 includes "displaying an enlargement of the subject image in response to a user selecting the desired point by a discrete touch-input on the touch sensitive display proximate to said desired point, and indicating on the enlargement a point determined from an area associated with said user touch-input on which said enlargement is based, wherein said determined point is associated with a center of said area" and "storing coordinates representing said determined point as a first coordinate parameter in response to a confirmation by the user that said determined point sufficiently corresponds to said desired point". In this way, the user may visually ascertain whether the determined point corresponds with or is sufficiently close to the desired point, and if so, confirm the same which results in the storing of coordinates of the determined point as a first coordinate parameter.

As indicated in MPEP § 2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant submits that Roy et al. neither discloses nor suggests the claim 1 limitations "displaying an enlargement of the

subject image in response to a user selecting the desired point by a discrete touch-input on the touch sensitive display proximate to said desired point, and indicating on the enlargement a point determined from an area associated with said user touch-input on which said enlargement is based, wherein said determined point is associated with a center of said area" and "storing coordinates representing said determined point as a first coordinate parameter in response to a confirmation by the user that said determined point sufficiently corresponds to said desired point". In particular, since in Roy et al., the selecting of a point is being performed by a mouse cursor, the selecting is very accurate. However, when the selecting is done with, for example, a user's finger on a touch-sensitive display, as opposed to indicating a point, the user's finger describes a distinct area on the display. The subject invention then determines (via calculation) a point representing the center of an area and displays this point on the enlarged displayed image. The user is then able to visually confirm that the determined point coincides (or is sufficiently close to) the desired point.

With regard to the limitation "storing coordinates representing said determined point as a first coordinate parameter in response to a confirmation by the user that said determined point sufficiently corresponds to said desired point", it appears the Examiner equates this to "the display of information relating to selected map objects through reports, at col. 12, lines 57-62, which includes returning point data, as seen in Appendix C of col.

19. Roy further discusses defining objects by co-ordinate values, at col. 5, lines 21-34".

Applicant submits that while Roy et al. may use coordinates to define the location of map objects, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Roy et al. of storing the coordinates representing the determined point as a first coordinate parameter. The significance of this becomes more apparent in claims 6 and 7 where a second determined point has its coordinates stored as a second coordinate parameter and the distance between the first and second coordinates is determined.

The Smith reference discloses a method and apparatus for adjusting the display scale of an image, in which when a user places a cursor at a desired location and indicates the same (e.g., clicking the mouse button), the display scale returns to the original setting and the location of the cursor is arguably stored.

However, Applicant submits that Smith does not supply that which is missing from Roy et al., i.e., "displaying an enlargement of the subject image in response to a user selecting the desired point by a discrete touch-input on the touch sensitive display proximate to said desired point, and indicating on the enlargement a point determined from an area associated with said user touch-input on which said enlargement is based, wherein said determined point is associated with a center of said area".

The Boyce et al. patent discloses a routing system in which actually traversable routes are used in determining the distance between two coordinates. However, Applicant submits that

Boyce et al. does not supply that which is missing from Roy et al., i.e., "displaying an enlargement of the subject image in response to a user selecting the desired point by a discrete touch-input on the touch sensitive display proximate to said desired point, and indicating on the enlargement a point determined from an area associated with said user touch-input on which said enlargement is based, wherein said determined point is associated with a center of said area".

In view of the above, believes that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15 and 17-20, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611